Comments on the proposed conservation of usage of *Acanthoteuthis* Wagner in Münster, 1839 and *Kelaeno* Münster, 1842 (Mollusca, Cephalopoda)

(Case 2902; see BZN **51**: 219–223)

(1) D.T. Donovan

Department of Geological Sciences, University College London, Gower Street, London WC1E 6BT, U.K.

In my application to the Commission I omitted to mention that d'Orbigny, who is credited with the first available publication of the generic name *Kelaeno* in 1841, himself later abandoned that name in the sense in which he had first used it, and adopted Münster's name *Acanthoteuthis* for the taxon in question. In 1845 (p. 407) he wrote in his systematic text : 'ACANTHOTEUTHIS Wagner / Syn. Kelaeno Munster 1846 (non Kelaeno Munster 1842)'. Thus it is clear that he adopted these two generic names in the sense used by the German palaeontologists Wagner and Münster.

Additional reference

Orbigny, A.d'. 1845. *Mollusques vivants et fossiles ou description de toutes les espèces de coquilles et de mollusques classées suivant leur distribution géologique et géographique*, vol. 1. 432 pp. Gide, Paris.

(2) W. Riegraf

Brüggefeldweg 31, D-48161 Münster, Germany

Donovan has clearly and correctly presented the facts concerning the state of *Acanthoteuthis* Wagner in Münster, 1839 and *Kelaeno* Münster, 1842. I fully support and agree with his proposals to the Commission.

I may mention that Münster (1839, p. 681) referred to *Acanthoteuthis* in a second paper, but as a nomen nudum.

Additional reference

Münster, G. Graf zu. 1839. Über einige Versteinerungen in den lithographischen Schiefern von Baiern. *Neues Jahrbuch für Mineralogie, Geognosie, Geologie und Petrefaktenkunde*, **5**: 676–682.

(3) Marion Nixon

Department of Geology, Birkbeck College, Malet Street, London WC1E 7HX, U.K.

I support the proposed application to conserve the current usage of the names *Acanthoteuthis* Wagner in Münster, 1839 and *Kelaeno* Münster, 1842 for two genera of Jurassic teuthoid coleid cephalopods.

(4) Theo S. Engeser

Geologisch-Paläontologisches Institut und Museum, Universität Hamburg, Bundesstrasse 55, 20146 Hamburg, Germany

1. I fully agree with Donovan that *Acanthoteuthis* Wagner in Münster, 1839 is a valid genus with *Acanthoteuthis speciosa* Münster, 1839 as its type species as designated by Bülow-Trummer in 1920.

2. I also agree that *Kelaeno* was not made available in Münster (1839) by the simple mention of the name. It does not appear in any combination with a valid specific name, nor is any indication given.

3. D'Orbigny (1841) published *Kelaeno* with two nominal species, *K. speciosa* (Münster, 1839) and *K. prisca* (Rüppell, 1829). Under Article 12b(5) of the Code this makes *Kelaeno* d'Orbigny, 1841 an available name. No type species was designated by d'Orbigny (1841). Later d'Orbigny (1842–1846) figured four specimens under the name *Kelaeno speciosa*; three of them belong to *Acanthoteuthis* and one is the gladius of *Plesioteuthis prisca* (Rüppell, 1829). D'Orbigny mixed up the two species, which belong to different orders of coleoid cephalopods. In Engeser (1986) I stated that *Kelaeno* d'Orbigny, 1841 is an objective synonym of *Acanthoteuthis* Wagner in Münster, 1839. However, this is not correct since d'Orbigny had mentioned two species in combination with *Kelaeno* and a type species had not then been designated for that genus. In Engeser (1987) I corrected this and designated *Acanthoteuthis speciosa* Münster, 1839 as its type species. Thus *Kelaeno* d'Orbigny, 1841 is an objective synonym of *Acanthoteuthis* Wagner in Münster, 1839.

4. As stated in para. 2 of the application, it is clear that in 1842 Münster used *Kelaeno* in a quite different sense from d'Orbigny the previous year. Münster included two nominal species, *K. scutellaris* and *K. arquata*, and Bülow-Trummer (1920) later selected *K. arquata* as type species (para. 5 of the application). However, *Kelaeno* Münster, 1842 is a homonym of *Kelaeno* d'Orbigny, 1841. *Celaeno* Owen, 1844 is only an incorrect subsequent spelling and not available, but Wagner (1860) explicitly 'corrected' the latinization of *Kelaeno* Münster, 1842 to *Celaeno* and this, although an unjustified emendation, is an available name. *Celaeno* Wagner, 1860 is a junior objective synonym of *Kelaeno* Münster, 1842.

5. Schevill (1950) wrongly interpreted *Kelaeno* Münster, 1839 as an available name and *Kelaeno* Münster, 1842 as a junior homonym of it. He proposed the replacement name *Münsterella*, but his designation of *K. scutellaris* as type species is invalid since *K. arquata* is automatically the type under Article 67h of the Code. Roger (1952) and Krimholz (1958) followed the argument of Schevill (1950). I (Engeser, 1988) rejected Schevill's (1950) argument and pointed out the homonymy between *Kelaeno* d'Orbigny, 1841 and *Kelaeno* Münster, 1842. Two junior synonyms were available as a replacement name — *Celaeno* Wagner, 1860 and *Münsterella* Schevill, 1850. Since *Celaeno* Wagner, 1860 is preoccupied (see para. 3 of the application), I adopted *Münsterella* (now spelled *Muensterella*) Schevill, 1950 instead of *Kelaeno* Münster, 1842. I see no reason to change my view and therefore do not support Donovan's proposal.

6. I also have a different view of the 'generally accepted usage' of Münster's *Kelaeno*. My synonymy list (Engeser, 1988) shows that in the past 150 years about ten authors have used the spelling *Kelaeno* (including the incorrect subsequent spellings *Kalaeno* Krimholz, 1958 and *Kelaena* Walther, 1904), about five authors have used *Celaeno* and four have used *Münsterella* (or its corrected form *Muensterella*). Kretzoi (1942) figured the genus in question under the generic name *Listroteuthis* Naef, 1922, but this was probably a lapsus calami for *Celaeno* since *Listroteuthis* was called

Celaeno. Bandel & Boletzky (1988) called the genus *Celaenoteuthis* for unknown reasons. Since 1950, four authors have used *Kelaeno* (and variants, including *Celaeno*) and four authors *Muensterella* (including *Münsterella*). It follows that there is no consistent use of the generic name *Kelaeno* (including *Celaeno*) for the genus of coleoid cephalopods proposed by Münster in 1842.

7. Since there is confusion in the meaning of *Kelaeno* and also in its spelling, it would be best to reject *Kelaeno* Münster, 1842 as a junior homonym of *Kelaeno* d'Orbigny, 1841, and to use the unambiguous replacement name *Muensterella* Schevill, 1950 (with *Kelaeno arquata* Münster, 1842 as the type species).

8. The family name KELAENIDAE (or CELAENIDAE) based on *Kelaeno* (or *Celaeno*) has a similar inconsistent use in the literature. It would be preferable to replace it by MÜNSTERELLIDAE Roger, 1952 in its corrected form MUENSTERELLIDAE.

9. For the reasons given above, I support Donovan's proposals regarding *Acanthoteuthis* but oppose the conservation of *Kelaeno* Münster, 1842. *Muensterella* Schevill, 1850 should be used rather than *Kelaeno*.

Additional references

Bandel, K. & Boletzky, S. von. 1988. Features of development and functional morphology required in the reconstruction of early coleoid cephalopods. Pp. 229–246 *in*: Wiedman, J. & Kullmann, J. (Eds.). *Cephalopods — present and past*. Schweizerbart'sche, Stuttgart.

Engeser, T. 1986. Beschreibung einer wenig bekannten und einer neuen Coleoiden-Art (Vampyromorphoidea, Cephalopoda) aus dem Untertithonium von Solnhofen und Eichstätt (Bayern). *Archaeopteryx*, 4: 27–35.

Engeser, T. 1987. Nachtrag zur Nomenklatur der coleoiden Cephalopoden des 'Solnhofener Plattenkalks' (Untertithonium). *Archaeopteryx*, **5**: 65–67.

Kretzoi, M. 1942. *Necroteuthis* n. gen. (Ceph. Dibr., Necroteuthidae n.f.) aus dem Oligozän von Budapest und das System der Dibranchiata. *Földtani Közlöny*, **72**: 124–138.

Orbigny, A.d'. 1842–1846. *Paléontologie Française. Terrain Jurassique*, vol. 1. Masson, Paris.

Walther, J. 1904. Die Fauna der Solnhofener Plattenkalke. Bionomisch betrachtet. *Jenaer Denkschriften*, 9: 135–214.

Comments on the proposed conservation of *Lironeca* Leach, 1818 (Crustacea, Isopoda) as the correct original spelling

(Case 2915; see BZN **51**: 224–226)

(1) L.B. Holthuis

Nationaal Natuurhistorisch Museum, Postbus 9517, 2300 RA Leiden, The Netherlands

A few remarks in defence of the name *Livoneca* Leach, 1818 and in opposition to the application seem to be called for.

As Drs Williams and Bowman have pointed out, in Leach's original publication (1818) the spelling *Livoneca* and its French equivalent Livonèce appeared consistently (4 and 5 times respectively). No explanation was given for this name nor for the others in the group, among which are *Nelocira*, *Cirolana*, *Conilera*, *Rocinela*, *Canolira*, *Anilocra*, *Olencira* and *Nerocila*. It was only much later that White (1857, p. 250) pointed out the connection with the name Carolina in the cases of *Cirolana*,